

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1, 3-8 and 11-14 have been amended, claims 2, 9 and 10 have been cancelled and claims 22-27 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-8, 11-14 and 22-27 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 22 are independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

***Specification Objection***

In the Office Action, the specification has been objected to for informality in page 8. In this response, the specification has been amended to correct the informality as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

***Claim Objection***

In the Office Action, Claim 2 has been objected to for informality therein. In this response, claim 2 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection for claim 2.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph***

Claims 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Particularly, the Examiner pointed out that the recitation “the first light source plate” in line 3 lacks proper antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In this response, the recitation “the first light source plate” has been deleted from claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claim 5.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,048,071 issued to Sawayama (“Sawayama”). Since claims 2 and 9 have been cancelled, claims 1 and 4-8 are now subject to this rejection. Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In this response, independent claim 1 has been amended to clearly differentiate it from the cited references. Amended claim 1 recites:

“1. A display device, comprising:  
...  
a first light guiding plate adjoining the light source and guiding the light beam generated from the light source *in a first direction*; and  
a second light guiding plate adjoining the first light guiding plate, formed on the display panel and guiding the light beam from the first light guiding plate *in a second direction substantially perpendicular to the first direction*,  
...”

An example of these claimed features are shown in FIG. 3 of the present application, in which the first light guiding plate 12 is guiding the light beam generated from the light source 10

in a direction substantially parallel to the side of the first light guiding plate 12 adjoining the second light guiding plate. Also, the second light guiding plate guides the light beam from the first light guiding plate in a direction *substantially perpendicular* to the side of the light guiding plate 12.

In this regard, the Examiner asserted that, in Sawayama, the combination of a prism sheet 81 and a diffusion sheet 82 in FIG. 1 constitutes the claimed first light guiding plate. This assertion is respectfully disagreed because the prism sheet 81 and the diffusion sheet 82 in combination do not function as a light guiding plate.

Also, in Sawayama the light-conducting body 24 guides the light beam from the prism sheet 81 in a direction substantially perpendicular to the light-entry surface 25. However, as previously mentioned, the prism sheet 81 and the diffusion sheet 82 do not perform the function of guiding a light beam. Thus, it would be physically impossible for the prism sheet 81 and the diffusion sheet 82 to guide the light beam from the light source 26 in a direction perpendicular to the direction in which the light-conducting body 24 guides the light beam from the prism sheet.

For theses reasons, it is submitted that Sawayama fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features of “a first light guiding plate ... guiding the light beam generated from the light source in a first direction” and “a second light guiding plate ... guiding the light beam from the first light guiding plate in a second direction substantially perpendicular to the first direction”.

Thus, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Sawayama. Claims 4-7 that are dependent from claim 1 would be also patentable at least for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 4-7.

Claims 1-3 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,340,999 issued to Masuda, *et al.* (“Masuda”). Since claims 2, 9 and 10 have been cancelled, claims 1, 3 and 11-13 are now subject to this rejection. Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted “a light guiding part 3” (Office Action, Page 5) and “a first light guiding plate 3a disposed at on side of the light source 2” (Office Action, Page 6). This assertion is respectfully disagreed because the light introduction surface 3a of the light guide 3a is integral to the light guide 3, not an independent element that is physically separated from the light guide 3a. In other words, it is logically flawed to assert that a side surface of a plate is another plate disposed on the side surface. Thus, it is submitted that Masuda fails to teach or suggest the claimed first light guiding plate, as claimed.

Also, amended independent claim 1 recites “a first light guiding plate ... guiding the light beam generated from the light source in a first direction” and “a second light guiding plate ... guiding the light beam from the first light guiding plate in a second direction substantially perpendicular to the first direction”. Masuda fails to teach or disclose this claimed feature.

Thus, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Masuda. Claims 3 and 11-13 that are dependent from claim 1 would be also patentable at least for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3 and 11-13.

In the Office Action, claims 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masuda. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 is dependent from claim 1. As previously mentioned, claim 1 has been amended and is now believe to be patentable over Masuda. No secondary reference has been introduced to cure the deficiency from the teachings of Masuda. Thus, it is submitted that dependent claim 14 is patentable over Masuda. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 14.

***Added Claims***

In this response, claims 22-27 have been newly added, of which claim 22 is independent, in order to claim the invention from the different perspectives.

Independent claim 22 recites “a first light guiding plate adjoining the light source and having a first pattern for uniformly inducing the light beam” and “a second light guiding plate adjoining the first light guiding plate and having a second pattern for reflecting the light beam guided from the first light guiding plate toward the display panel”. In this regard, Applicants believe that none of the cited references discloses or suggests these claims features.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott H. Hawranek  
Reg. No. 52,411

Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: November 4, 2003

**McGuireWoods LLP**  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280  
HCP:WSC/kbs

\\COM217811.1